

### INTERVIEW SUMMARY

In a phone interview on October 12, 2005, clarification was sought of the Examiner's Response to Arguments in the Office Action dated July 21, 2005. In particular, clarification of the statement, "Those of ordinary skill in the art would be intuitively motivated to select such a voltage source," was requested. It was pointed out that neither the Cave nor Yokomizo references appear to suggest the claimed combination, and it is not clear what would motivate one of skill in the art to choose these particular voltage sources for use with a wordline. In addition, with respect to the rejection of claims 18-19 over Cave, clarification was sought as to how the voltage supplied to element 32 is considered a voltage "used in" the stage as claimed. No agreement was reached with respect to the rejected claims.

### REMARKS

Claims 15-25 and 28-32 are pending in this application.


Claims 29-32 have been allowed.

Claims 15-25 and 28 were rejected and are canceled. The rejection with respect to these claims is believed to be in error. However, in order to further the prosecution of this application, the rejected claims are canceled from this application. Thus, only allowed claims remain in this application.

### CONCLUSION

In view of the amendments and remarks contained herein, it is believed that all claims are in condition for allowance and an indication of their allowance is requested. However, if the Examiner is aware of any additional matters that should be discussed, a call to the undersigned attorney at: (415) 318-1163 would be appreciated.

Respectfully submitted,

 October 20, 2005

Gerald P. Parsons  
Reg. No. 24,486

Date

Attorney Docket No.: SNDK.307US1

Application No.: 10/811,074

- 3 of 3 -